Case 1:04-cv-11524-DPW Document 1 Filed 07/09/2004 Page 1 of 15

RECEIPT # SUMMONS ISSUED LOCAL RULE 4.1. WAIVER FORM. MCF ISSUED. BY DPTY, CLK

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

234 JUL -7 P 3: 40 .O. DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF MASS.

TYCO HEALTHCARE GROUP LP

Plaintiff,

V.

MEDICAL PRODUCTS, INC.

Defendant.

Civil Action No.

04-11524DPW
MAGISTRATE JUDGE ALLYGINGER

COMPLAINT

Plaintiff Tyco Healthcare Group LP ("Tyco Healthcare") brings this action seeking injunctive relief, damages, double and treble damages, attorneys' fees, and other relief due to the fraudulent conduct of Medical Products, Inc. ("MPI"). MPI engaged in a scheme to defraud Tyco Healthcare, using false statements and falsified invoices, in order to induce Tyco Healthcare to pay MPI hundreds of thousands of dollars in unearned rebate payments. Tyco Healthcare seeks to recover the substantial damages caused to it by reason of MPI's fraud and deceit, unfair and deceptive acts and practices in violation of Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 93A, breach of contract, and breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing, all resulting in substantial damages to Tyco Healthcare.

PARTIES

- 1. Tyco Healthcare is a Delaware limited partnership with a usual place of business in Mansfield, Massachusetts. Tyco Healthcare manufactures and sells various medical products.
- 2. MPI is a Mississippi corporation with a usual place of business in Ripley, Mississippi. MPI purchases medical products from manufacturers and distributes those medical products to various end-users.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 3. Personal jurisdiction over MPI in Massachusetts exists pursuant to Mass.

 Gen. Laws ch. 223A, §3, the Massachusetts "long-arm" statute because MPI committed fraudulent acts in Massachusetts, entered into, and breached, agreements in Massachusetts, committed tortious acts in Massachusetts, causing substantial harm and damages in Massachusetts, and does business in Massachusetts.
- 4. This court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1332 because the matter in controversy exceeds \$75,000 and the controversy is between citizens of different states.
- 5. Tyco Healthcare is a citizen of Delaware and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for purposes of this action because it has its principal place of business in Massachusetts. None of the partnership interests of Tyco Healthcare are citizens of Mississippi.
- 6. MPI is a citizen of Mississippi for purposes of this action because it is a Mississippi corporation and has its principal place of business in Mississippi.

7. Venue in this court is proper because Tyco Healthcare's principal place of business is in Mansfield, Massachusetts and a substantial number of events, including fraudulent acts of MPI, giving rise to Tyco Healthcare's claims occurred in this District.

FACTS

Background

- 8. Tyco Healthcare is engaged in the business of manufacturing and selling health care products. As used herein, the term "Tyco Healthcare" includes its divisions. including The Kendall Company. This matter concerns needle and syringe products manufactured and sold to MPI by Tyco Healthcare (the "Products").
- 9. Tyco Healthcare uses a number of distributor arrangements to sell the Products to end-user customers in various markets.
- 10. Customers for the Products include end-users in veterinary medicine (the "veterinary market") and human healthcare facilities such as nursing homes and clinics, which are referred to as alternate sites (the "alternate site market").
- 11. Among the arrangements used by Tyco Healthcare to distribute the Products in the market are "rebate contracts" and "net bill contracts" with distributors.
- 12. Under a rebate contract, a distributor agrees to purchase Products at a dealer list price, which the distributor pays to Tyco Healthcare. Provided the distributor's sales to end-users are consistent with Tyco Healthcare's policies, the terms of the rebate contracts, and other applicable distributor agreements and policies, the distributor may apply for and receive a rebate of a portion of the dealer list price.

- 13. Under a net bill contract, a distributor agrees to purchase Products at a price determined by the contract, and to be bound by other terms of the net bill contract. Under a net bill contract, the distributor is generally not entitled to a rebate.
- 14. Reflecting costs and other market dynamics, rebate contracts are not used for sales to the veterinary market, and distributors are generally not entitled to receive rebates for sales to the veterinary market.
- 15. Tyco Healthcare's Rebate Policy is incorporated into Tyco Healthcare's rebate contracts. A copy of the Rebate Policy is provided to all distributors with rebate contracts, including MPI.
- 16. Under the Rebate Policy a distributor is eligible to receive a contract rebate only if the product was sold directly to a qualified customer eligible to purchase that product under a contract duly authorized by Tyco Healthcare.
- 17. Further, under the Rebate Policy, Tyco Healthcare reserves the right to conduct audits of the distributor's purchases at reasonable times and the distributor agrees to cooperate fully in providing files and documents necessary for such audits.
- 18. In order to receive a qualified rebate, a distributor must submit a Rebate Claim Form that includes evidence of the sale of the Products to qualified customers.
- 19. In doing so, the distributor certifies that the information contained in the Rebate Claim Form is accurate and that the rebate request meets all the policy requirements.
- 20. Distributors submitting rebate claims, including MPI, agree that in the event of an unauthorized rebate payment, Tyco Healthcare may recover any moneys paid in addition to reasonable costs associated with audit and collection procedures.

21. The Tyco Healthcare Distributor Policies and Procedures similarly provide that "Distributor must sell contracted Product directly to a qualified Customer eligible to purchase that Product under a Rebate (charge back) Contract duly authorized by [Tyco Healthcare] Affiliate."

The MPI Rebate Scam

- 22. MPI is a medical equipment supplier located in Ripley, Mississippi.
- 23. In 1999, MPI had been a Tyco Healthcare distributor under a net bill contract. MPI violated its agreement and obligations under the net bill contract, was informed of those violations, and the net bill contract was terminated.
- 24. In early 2001 MPI's president, Eddie McCafferty, contacted a Tyco
 Healthcare sales representative and asked for information about "how the rebate program
 works." Mr. McCafferty and MPI then sought to obtain rebate contracts with Tyco
 Healthcare.
- 25. In seeking rebate contracts from Tyco Healthcare, Mr. McCafferty and MPI represented that CP Medical, a Portland, Oregon company, would purchase Tyco Healthcare products through MPI. Mr. McCafferty and MPI contacted Tyco Healthcare representatives and, based on MPI's representation that the MPI purchases of Products for sale to CP Medical were consistent with rebate contract terms and conditions, obtained a rebate contract with Tyco Healthcare for Products sold by MPI to CP Medical.
- 26. In March 2003, based on similar representations, MPI obtained a similar rebate contract from Tyco Healthcare for products that MPI falsely represented were to be sold to CP Medical.

Filed 07/09/2004

- 27. Following the 2001 rebate contract and continuing until at least July 2003, MPI regularly purchased from Tyco Healthcare types of Products, including needles, syringes and other products, that are of the type used by end-users in both the veterinary and alternate site markets.
- 28. Between July 2001 and July 2003, MPI submitted over seventy fraudulent rebate claim forms which falsely represented that sales qualifying for rebates were made to CP Medical. These fraudulent claim forms were intended to defraud, and did defraud Tyco Healthcare.
- 29. In reliance on the fraudulent rebate claim forms submitted by MPI, Tyco Healthcare was deceived into paying to MPI over \$430,000.00.
- 30. The representations by Mr. McCafferty and MPI that the Products were purchased by MPI and sold to CP Medical under the rebate contract were knowingly false at the time they were made.
- 31. CP Medical did not purchase the Products that MPI had falsely claimed to have sold to CP Medical. Instead, MPI diverted the Products to other end-users.
- 32. When Tyco Healthcare representatives questioned MPI and Mr. McCafferty about the MPI rebate claims and purported sales to CP Medical, Mr. McCafferty and MPI made repeated false statements in an attempt to conceal and further MPI's scheme to defraud Tyco Healthcare.
- 33. MPI submitted fraudulent invoices, which falsely stated that MPI had made Product sales to CP Medical.

Filed 07/09/2004

- 34. MPI, despite a duty to disclose truthful information and cooperate with any audit or inquiry by Tyco Healthcare, refused to provide truthful information or requested documents.
- As described herein, in furtherance of the MPI's scheme to defraud Tyco Healthcare, MPI engaged in numerous fraudulent acts, including, without limitation, the following:
 - a. Sending to Tyco Healthcare's principal place of business in Mansfield, Massachusetts over seventy fraudulent rebate claim request forms, each one of which contained the knowing false statement that the products identified by MPI on the rebate claim request form had been sold by MPI to CP Medical. MPI sent these false statements and rebate requests to Tyco Healthcare by wire with the intent to further their scheme of defrauding Tyco Healthcare on at least the following occasions:
 - i. April 9, 2001
 - ii. May 8, 29, 2001
 - iii. June 8, 13, 20, 27, 2001
 - iv. August 2, 10, 20, 2001
 - v. September 4, 21, 24 and 25, 2001
 - vi. October 24, 2001
 - vii. November 8, 19, 28, 2001
 - viii. December 11, 17, 2001
 - ix. January 4, 15, 21, 28, 2002

- x. February 5, 14 and 22, 2002
- xi. March 8, 19 and 26, 2002
- xii. April 3, 8, 16 and 22, 2002
- xiii. May 1, 10, 13, 15, 16, 17, 21, 23 and 31, 2002
- xiv. June 4, 11, 20 and 27, 2002
- xv. July, 1 and 24, 2002
- xvi. August 12, 2002
- xvii. September 9 and 16, 2002
- xviii. October 7, 10 and 31, 2002
 - xix. November 19, 2002
 - xx. December 5, 2002
 - xxi. January 9 and 15, 2003
- xxii. February 11, 2003
- xxiii. March 27 and 31, 2003
- xxiv. April 9 and 14, 2003
- xxv. May 16, 21, 27 and 29, 2003
- xxvi. June 2, and 17, 2003;
- xxvii. July 1, 14 and 22, 2003;
- b. For the purpose of continuing and concealing its scheme to defraud Tyco Healthcare, and with the intent to deceive Tyco Healthcare, on August 21, 2003 MPI sent by mail to Tyco Healthcare's distributor audit manager in Tyco Healthcare's principal place of business in Mansfield, Massachusetts over fifty "invoices" which were fraudulent

- in that each "invoice" contained the false statement "sold to CP Medical." In fact, none of the products identified on the invoices were sold to CP Medical.
- c. With the intent of continuing and concealing its scheme to defraud

 Tyco Healthcare, on August 21, 2003, MPI sent by mail to Tyco

 Healthcare's distributor audit manager employed in Tyco Healthcare's

 principal place of business in Mansfield, Massachusetts a letter

 containing additional false statements, including false statements such

 as "The following are invoices of products shipped," and that invoices

 prior to March 2003 did not exist because "the past price changes are

 purged from one year to the next."

COUNT I

Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 93A, §§ 2 and 11

- 36. Tyco Healthcare restates the allegations contained in Paragraphs 1 through 35.
 - 37. MPI is engaged in trade or commerce in Massachusetts.
- 38. MPI's diversion of Products to markets in violation of the MPI Rebate Contracts, submission of false rebate claims and other false information; making of false statements; failing to comply with reasonable audit and verification requests; failing to disclose what it was required to disclose; and other acts and omissions all constitute unfair or deceptive acts or practices, and unfair methods of competition, in violation of Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 93A §§2 and 11.

- 39. The actions or transactions constituting unfair or deceptive acts in violation of Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 93A occurred primarily and substantially in Massachusetts.
- 40. The actions of MPI in violation of Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 93A were intentional and willful, and caused and continue to cause substantial harm and damages to Tyco Healthcare.

COUNT II

FRAUD, MISREPRESENTATION, AND DECEIPT

- 41. Tyco Healthcare restates the allegations contained in Paragraphs 1 through 40 of this Complaint.
- 42. The numerous false statements and false documents made and submitted by MPI to defraud Tyco Healthcare constitute material statements of fact.
- 43. MPI's false statements, false documents, and fraudulent scheme were knowingly false at the time they were made, and were intentionally made in order to deceive Tyco Healthcare.
- 44. MPI's false statements, false documents, and fraudulent scheme did in fact deceive Tyco Healthcare.
- 45. As a result of MPI's defrauding and deceit of Tyco Healthcare, Tyco Healthcare was fraudulently induced to pay hundreds of thousands of dollars to the defendants.
- 46. Tyco Healthcare reasonably relied upon the statements, documents and representations made and submitted by the defendants.
- 47. MPI's conduct described herein constitutes unlawful fraud, deceit and intentional misrepresentation, and has caused Tyco Healthcare substantial damages.

COUNT III

Breach of Contract

- 48. Tyco Healthcare restates the allegations contained in Paragraphs 1 through 47 of this Complaint.
- 49. MPI agreed to comply with the MPI Rebate Contracts, including policies and terms incorporated therein.
- 50. Tyco Healthcare has duly performed all of its obligations under the terms of MPI Rebate Contracts.
- 51. MPI breached the MPI Rebate Contracts by diverting the Products to markets in violation of the MPI Rebate Contracts, by submitting false rebate claims and other false information; making false statements; failing to comply with reasonable audit and verification requests, and by other acts and omissions.
- 52. As a result of MPI's breach of MPI Rebate Contracts, Tyco Healthcare has suffered substantial harm and damages.

COUNT IV

Breach of Implied Covenant of Good Faith and Fair Dealing

- 53. Tyco Healthcare restates the allegations contained in Paragraphs 1 through52 of this Complaint.
- 54. Implied in the MPI Rebate Contracts is a covenant of good faith and fair dealing.
- 55. MPI has breached the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing by, among other things, submitting false rebate claims and other false information; making

false statements; failing to comply with reasonable audit and verification requests; and by other acts and omissions described above.

56. As a result of its breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing, MPI has caused Tyco Healthcare to suffer substantial harm and damages.

REQUEST FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Tyco Healthcare respectfully requests that this Court:

- (1) enter judgment in Tyco Healthcare's favor on all counts of this Complaint;
- (2) grant permanent injunctive relief requiring MPI to account for and return all rebates paid by Tyco Healthcare to MPI;
- (3) award Tyco Healthcare compensatory and exemplary damages in an amount to be determined at trial;
- (4) award Tyco Healthcare treble damages, attorneys' fees, costs and other relief in accordance with Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 93A, §11;
- (5) require MPI to disgorge all revenue and profit obtained by MPI as a result of its unfair, deceptive, or otherwise improper and unlawful conduct;
- (6) grant such other relief as is appropriate and just.

Dated: July 7, 2004

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Tyco Healthcare demands a trial by jury on those causes of action and issues on which Tyco Healthcare is so entitled.

Respectfully submitted,

TYCO HEALTHCARE GROUP LP

By its attorneys:

Jeffrey D/Clements, BBO #632544

Ben T. Clements, BBO #555802

Clements & Clements LLP

50 Federal Street

Boston, MA 02110

(617) 451-1802

SJS 44 (Rev. 3/99)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS-44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace acr supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet: (SEB INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

use of the Clerk of Court for	the purpose of intraum.		, File	(5) (3) (4) (4)		
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS				DEFENDANT	TS .	
Tyco Hea	lthcare Gro	up LP 🐃 🙏	<u>H</u> -	Ŋ₽3:Whedic	al Products,	Inc.
(b) County of Residence of		Bristolo o	- T	COUNTY of Resider MASS. NOTE: IN LANG	nce of First Listed (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES) CONDEMNATION CASES, US NVOLVED.	Tippah ONLY) E THE LOCATION OF THE
(c) Attorney's (Firm Name	Address and Telephone	Number)	•	Attorneys (If Kno	own)	
Jeffrey Clements 50 Feder	D. Clements & Clements cal Street,	, LLP Boston MA			11024	Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff
II. BASIS OF JURISD	ICTION (Place an "X" i	in One Box Only)		(For Diversity Cases Only)	RINCIPAL PARTIES	and One Box for Defendant)
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	☐ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)			Citizen of This State	DEF 1 Incorporated or 1 of Business h	Principal Place 4 4 This State
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	and the contract of the contra			Citizen of Another State	2 2 Incorporated and of Business h	Principal Place ☐ 5 ☐ 5 Another State
			_	Citizen or Subject of a □ 3 □ 3 Foreign Nation □ 6 □ Foreign Country		
IV. NATURE OF SUIT			 1	FORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES
CONTRACT 110 Insurance 120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of 152 Recovery of Defauted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation 220 Force losure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assa ult, Libel & Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 350 M otor Vehicle Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury CIVIL RIGHTS 441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Housing/ Accommodations 444 W elfare 440 Other Civil Rights	PRISONER PETIT 510 Motions to Vac Sentence Habeas Corpus: 530 General 535 De ath Penalty 540 Mandamus & C 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition	RTY RTY RTY Received	610 Agriculture 620 Other Food & Drug 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 630 Liquor Laws 640 R.R. & Truck 650 Airline Regs. 660 Occupational Safety/Health 690 Other LABOR 710 Fair Labor Sundards Act 720 Labor/M gmt. Relations 730 Labor/M gmt. Reporting & Disclosure Act 740 Railway Labor Act 790 Other Labor Litigation 791 Empi. Ret. Inc. Security Act	□ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 □ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 PROPERTY RIGHTS □ 820 Co pyrights □ 830 Patent □ 840 Trad emark SOCIAL SECURITY □ 861 H IA (13 95ff) □ 862 Black Lung (923) □ 863 DIW C/DIW W (405 (g)) □ 864 SSID Tâle XVI □ 865 RSI (405(g)) FEDERAL TAX SUITS □ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defenda nt) □ 871 IRS —Third Party 26 USC 7609	400 State Reap portionment 410 Antitust 430 Banks and Banking 450 Commerce/ICC Rates/etc. 460 Deportation 470 Racke teer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations 810 Selective Service 850 Securitiss/Commodities/Exchange 12 USC 3410 391 Agricultural Acts 892 Economic Stabilization Act 893 Environmental Matters 894 Energy Allocation Act 895 Freedom of Information Act 900 App eal of Fee Determent@hual Access to Justice 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes 890 Other Statutory Actions
V. ORIGIN X Original 2 Proceeding S	Removed from 3 State Court	Remanded from Appellate Court	filing		Litigation	
VI. CAUSE OF ACT	Do not cité jurisdictio	nal statutes unless diversi	ty.)			
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: VIII. RELATED CAS	UNDER F.R.C	S IS A CLASS ACT P. 23		SC Sec. 1332 DEMANDS	JURY DEMAND	y if demanded in complaint: : X I Yes □ No
DATE FOR OFFICE USE/ONLY RECEIPT #	2009 (SIGNATURE OF A	12	JUDGE	DOCKET NUMBER MAG. JL	DGE

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

		DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETT	is in EUSD.
	e of first party on each side only		Products. Inc.
Тусо	Healthcare Group	p LP v. Medica	l Products, Inc. 1977 17" code listed on the civil cover sheet. (See - 7 p
Category in which	the case belongs based upon	the numbered nature of suit	code listed on the civil cover sheet. (See - 7
local rule 40.1(a)(1)).		U.S. Mersey
<u> </u>	160, 410, 470, R.23, REGARDI	LESS OF NATURE OF SUIT.	U.S. DISTRICT COL DISTRICT OF MAS
Transport	195, 368, 400, 440, 441-444, 740, 790, 791, 820*, 830*, 840		730, *Also complete AU 120 of AU 121
X III.	110, 120, 130, 140, 151, 190, 315, 320, 330, 340, 345, 350, 380, 385, 450, 891.		
IV.	220, 422, 423, 430, 460, 510,	530, 610, 620, 630, 640, 650	, 660,
	690, 810, 861-865, 870, 871,		-11524DPW
<u></u> v.	150, 152, 153.	V	
Has a prior action	between the same parties and	I based on the same claim ev	rer been filed in this court?
,	·		YES NO K
Does the complain 28 USC §2403)	nt in this case question the con	nstitutionality of an act of con	gress affecting the public interest? (See
16 !- 45- 11 C A	or an officer, agent or employe	ne of the U.S. a narty?	YES NO X
11 50, 15 tile 0.3.A.	or an officer, agent or employe	or or the order a party.	YES NO
is this case requir	red to be heard and determined	by a district court of three ju	udges pursuant to title 28 USC §2284?
			YES NO X
Do <u>all</u> of the partic Massachusetts (" 40.1(d)).	es in this action, excluding gov governmental agencies"), res	vernmental agencies of the u iding in Massachusetts resid	nited states and the Commonwealth of e in the same division? - (See Local Rule
			YES X NO
A.	If yes, in which division do a	all of the non-governmental p	arties reside?
	Eastern Division X	Central Division	Western Division
В.	If no, in which division do the agencies, residing in Massa		the only parties, excluding governmental
	Eastern Division	Central Division	Western Division
	f Removal - are there any motionarate sheet identifying the motion		requiring the attention of this Court? (If
yes, submit a sep			YES NO
yes, submit a sep		ut a	YES NO
yes, submit a sepset TYPE OR PRINT) NAME $J\in$	effrey D. Clemen ats & Clements,		